

**REMARKS**

This is a Reply to the Final Action dated December 23, 2005. All of the claims were rejected. Claims 1, 6-14, 19-27 and 32-44 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,133,847 to Yang. Claims 4, 5, 17, 18, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to further clarify the claimed limitations for allowance or appeal. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of the claims are respectfully traversed because for at least the following reasons, the references individually or combined, do not disclose the claimed limitations.

**Arguments**

At the outset Applicant notes that the Examiner's reasons for rejection of the claims on pages 2-7 of the final action are the same as in the prior office action, which Applicant responds to further below.

In response to Applicant's arguments, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states about Yang that: The system does obtain information from one or more devices currently connected to the network according to Yang's teaching at column 8, lines 10 to 14, in which "the remote control device could received an interface control signal from each of the appliances on the network or in the room." And based on the obtained information, the system generates a top

page user interface description including a separate icon for each appliance that is available to be controlled (col. 8, lines 14-17).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In col. 8, lines 10-17 (relied on by the Examiner) or elsewhere, Yang does not disclose obtaining device information from devices for generating a user interface based at least on the obtained information including references to device, and in response to selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device information in the corresponding device and display a control interface including device data using the accessed device information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed herein.

In col. 8, lines 10-17, Yang states:

“In the network application described above, and for any application where multiple appliances to be controlled are located in the same room, the remote control device could receive an interface control signal for each of the appliances on the network or in the room. **The software could provide for a separate icon** to be displayed in message display window 142 for each appliance that is available to be controlled.” (emphasis added).

In Yang the software in memory 120 of the remote control 100 provides a separate icon in display 142 for each available appliance, but does not obtain the icon from the appliance.

References in the user interface claimed, are different from icons in Yang. Just because Yang displays appliance icons, it does not mean that Yang discloses references for direct access

to user interface information in the appliances. Yang does not disclose that: “the user interface including at least one reference associated with the device information in each of said devices currently connected to the network, ... in response to selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device information in the corresponding device and display a control interface including device data using the accessed device information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface,” as required by Claim 1. The Examiner has failed to establish how icons in Yang provide direct access from display 142 to information contained in appliances, which icons are used to access device information in the corresponding device and display a control interface including device data using the accessed device information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface.

Yang does not disclose that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the device user control interface information in the corresponding device is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed. Indeed, in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote, not the appliances. In col. 8, lines (19-24), Yang states: “The selection of the icon would provide a control signal to the functions interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory and configure the user interface function control panel so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected.” Clearly, in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote, not the appliances.

Yang does not disclose generating a user interface based on the obtained information from the devices. Rather, Yang states: "... the remote control device could receive an interface control signal for each of the appliances on the network or in the room. The software could provide for a separate icon to be displayed in message display window 142 for each appliance that is available to be controlled." Clearly, Yang does not disclose that the software provides a separate icon for each appliance based on the information in an interface control signal received for each of the appliances.

Further, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states that: According to Yang, the remote control, that uses to control the controlled devices currently connected to the network, does not contain the user control interface description of each corresponding controlled device. The user control interface description of each corresponding controlled device, that allows user interaction with the device, is contained within the corresponding controlled device and is download to the remote control device and stores in the memory (e.g., col. 4, lines 32-38). The user interface description (as explained in item (a) above) does include at least one electronic link (the user would *select the icon that represents the particular appliance*; col. 8, lines 18-19) providing direct access from the user interface description to at least the user control interface description contained in each corresponding device, which has been downloaded to the memory of the remote control (*the selection of the icon* would provide a control signal to the function interface and the functions interface would *then access the control software for that appliance from memory so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected*; col. 8, lines 19-

24). It is also further notice that selection on the icon, represents the particular appliance, that leads to accessing the control software for that appliance from memory is, in fact, “linking” to the control software for that appliance from memory.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, in col. 4, lines 32-38 (relied on by the Examiner),

Yang states:

“In utilizing the embodiment of FIG. 2A for the user interface 140, VCR 200 would download programming software to remote control device 100 that would be utilized by the remote control device to control the functions of the VCR. The programming software is downloaded to remote control device 100 over data link 150. Data interface 110 would receive the downloaded programming software and store the software in memory 120.”

Yang does not disclose the user interface description includes a reference providing direct access from the user interface description to said device information contained in said devices currently connected to the network, as claimed. The Examiner has failed to establish how icons in Yang provide direct access from display 142 to information contained in appliances.

Yang does not disclose that selection of an icon on display 142 causes control functions to be downloaded from an appliance to the memory 120 of remote 100. Rather such control functions are downloaded to memory 120 of the remote 100 *before* selection of an icon on the display 142.

Yang does not disclose that when a reference in the user interface is user, the control user interface in the corresponding appliance is accessed and obtained, in order to generate a control user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed. Indeed, in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote it self, not the appliances. In col. 8, lines (19-24), Yang states: “The selection of the icon would provide a control signal to the functions interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory and configure the user interface function control panel so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected.” Clearly, In Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote, not the appliances.

Further, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states that: Yang does teach when a link in the top page user interface description is user activated (e.g., the user would *select the icon that represents the particular appliance*; col. 8., lines 18-19), the control interface description in the corresponding device is accessed using the activated link to obtain device information and generate a device user interface for user interaction with that corresponding device (*the selection of the icon would provide a control signal to the function interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected*; col. 8, lines 19-24).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, references in the user interface as claimed, are different from icons in Yang. Just because Yang displays appliance icons, it does not mean that

Yang discloses references for direct access to control user interface in the appliances. Yang does not disclose that the user interface includes at least a reference providing direct access from the user interface to said device information contained in said devices, as required by Claim 1. The Examiner has failed to establish how icons in Yang provide direct access from display 142 to information contained in appliances.

Yang does not disclose that when a reference in the user interface is selected, the corresponding appliance's control user interface information in that appliance is accessed and obtained to generate a control user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed. Indeed, in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote itself, not the appliances. In col. 8, lines (19-24), Yang states: "The selection of the icon would provide a control signal to the functions interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory and configure the user interface function control panel so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected." Clearly, In Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote, not the appliances.

In Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either *pre-loaded* into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program *before* the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction

(col. 8, lines 59-66). There is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user a user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects a reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein.

Further, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states that: According to Yang's teachings at column 8, lines 10-25, and figure 5, remote control 100 as well as the devices 510, 620, 530 and 540 are connected to a network server 500 and they are all client devices received services from the server 500. Furthermore, the remote control 500 is capable of displaying a user interface 140.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Yang does not disclose connecting at least one client device to the network capable of displaying a user interface, and displaying a user interface on the client device for controlling devices that are currently connected to the network. Indeed, the device 100 is the remote control itself which is not a client device capable of displaying a user interface is connected to the network, according to the present invention. Remote control 100 does not perform any services for other devices in the network.

Further, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states that: Yang clearly teaches, at column 5, lines 40-47, TV 220 includes an interface control signal (device



information) which maintains “information that uniquely identifies the particular appliance”.

Therefore, Yang clearly teaches the device information in each device includes device identification information. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Yang, column 5, lines 40-47, does not disclose that *the device information in each device* includes device identification information, as claimed. Yang does not disclose that the TV 220 includes device information, and that device information includes device identification information. Yang simply mentions that the interface control signal contains information that uniquely identifies the particular appliance such that the appropriate control software can be retrieved from memory 120 in the remote controller 100 and utilized to configure user interface 140 to control that particular apparatus. However, Yang does not disclose *the device information in each device* includes device identification information, rather the control signal identifies the appliance, which is not based on device information in the appliance.

Further, on pages 8-10 of the Office Action the Examiner states that: Yang does teach Yang links for direct access to control programs in appliances as explained in (b) and (c) above. Using HTML technology to implement top page graphical user interface, that includes top level icons representing controlled appliances, and applying HTML link to link a selected device icon to another HTML page to display further functional control panel for controlling that particular device would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include hyper-text link HTML pages define sets of user interface functions for multiple devices, connected to a network, that enable user

interaction and control of those devices in Yang's method since hyper-text link HTML pages would allow the devices to be remotely controlled from the Internet via HTTP protocol.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Yang does not disclose associating a hyper-text link with the device information in each of said devices currently connected to the network, such that each hyper-text link provides access from the user interface to the device information in a corresponding device, as claimed herein. Yang does not disclose that device information in each device comprises an HTML page for user interaction with and/or control of that device, as claimed herein. There is no motivation or suggestion in Yang to modify it as the Examiner suggests. Further, as discussed above, Yang does not disclose references for direct access to control programs in appliances. Yang does not disclose that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed. Indeed, in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote 100, not the appliances. As such, there is no reason or motivation to include hyper-text links in Yang.

Further, in Yang, there is no mention, motivation or suggestion about Internet or HTTP protocol or suggestion to utilize such protocols in the remote control. Indeed, Yang does not disclose a user interface description that includes links/references to appliances, wherein when the reference for a device is selected by the user, the selected reference is used to access control

program information stored in the device to obtain the user interface for the selected device for the user to control the device. There is no user interface in Yang with references for access to appliances, wherein when the reference is selected by the user, the reference is used to access the appliance and access the user interface (i.e., control program) for the appliance. Rather, in Yang, an “interface control signal” is used to access control program of the appliance that is already stored in the remote control memory.

Below Applicant provides the following further arguments in response to the Examiner’s reasons for claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a), on pages 2-7 of the Office Action.

#### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Rejection of Claims 1, 6-14, 19-27 and 32-44 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang is respectfully traversed because, for at least the following reasons, Yang does not disclose all of the claimed limitations.

Yang is directed to a remote control device that is able to be programmed after initial manufacture to accommodate the control of additional apparatuses. The remote control device includes a multi-functional, interchangeable user interface where the interface is modified such that it is able to control the functions of a variety of different types of apparatuses. This is fundamentally different from the present invention.

As per Claim 1, Yang does not disclose obtaining device information from devices currently connected to the network, as claimed. Yang (col. 2, lines 10-14, relied on by the Examiner), does not disclose obtaining device information from devices currently connected to the network, as required by Claim 1. In col. 2, lines 10-14, Yang simply states:

“In the network application described above, and for any application where multiple appliances to be controlled are located in the same room, the remote control device could receive an interface control signal for each of the appliances on the network or in the room.”

The interface control signal in Yang is simply an appliance signal sent to the remote control which the remote control uses to retrieve the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory (Yang, col. 2, lines 27-30). This has nothing to do with obtaining device information *from devices* currently connected to the network.

Further, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-17 and 14-24), does not disclose generating a user interface based at least on the obtained information, the user interface including at least one reference associated with the device information in each of said devices currently connected to the network, as required by Claim 1. There is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed herein.

By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user an initial user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein.

Even if based on the Examiner's interpretation (which Applicant traverses), Yang's remote control provides a user with icons representing appliances (col. 8, lines 14-19, relied on by the Examiner), such icons do not form a user interface including reference links that provide direct access to information contained in the appliances, as claimed herein, wherein each reference itself is used to access device information contained in the corresponding appliance.

There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of: in response to selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface

including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as required by Claim 1. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite specific language in Yang which discloses such limitations.

Not only Yang does not disclose generating a user interface, in Yang there is no step of *presenting to* a user a user interface with a list of references that provide direct access to control programs contained in the appliances themselves (and there is no need for such a feature in Yang). By contrast, as discussed, in Yang, without user intervention the control programs for appliances are either pre-loaded into the remote control memory, or the remote control automatically downloads an appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction.

Yang does not disclose that in response to selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device information in the corresponding device and display a control interface including device data using the accessed device information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully requested that rejection of Claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 27 and 41 were rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, rejection of Claims 14, 27 and 41, and claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully traversed for

at least the reasons provided in relation to Claim 1.

As per Claims 6, 19 and 32, as discussed, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24) does not disclose generating and displaying a user interface including references to devices as claimed. Further, the device 100 is the remote control itself which is not a *client device* capable of displaying a user interface is connected to the network, according to the present invention. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 6, 19 and 32 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 7, 20 and 33, Yang (col. 8, lines 18-24) does not disclose that the device information in each device further includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device, and upon detecting user selection of a device from the user interface, accessing and then displaying the control interface description in the corresponding device for user command and control of the device, as claimed.

Not only Yang does not disclose generating a user interface, and there is no step of presenting to a user a user interface with a list of references that provide direct access to control programs contained in the appliances themselves. By contrast, as discussed, in Yang, without user intervention the control programs for appliances are either pre-loaded into the remote control memory, or the remote control automatically downloads an appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction.

There is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that upon detecting user selection of a device from the user interface, accessing and then displaying the control interface description in the corresponding device for user command and control of the device, as claimed. By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein. There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of in response to selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite specific language in Yang which discloses such limitations. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 7, 20 and 33



should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 8, 21 and 34, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24) does not disclose generating each user interface such that the reference in that user interface provides access to at least the information in each corresponding device, as claimed. There is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, as claimed. In Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66). Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of information in each corresponding appliance 150 itself which allows, when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 to download the corresponding device information from the appliance itself. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 8, 21 and 34 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 9, 22 and 35, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24) does not disclose generating each user interface such that the user interface further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, as claimed. In col. 8, lines 14-24 (or elsewhere in Yang) there is no disclosure of obtaining information from each appliance, as

claimed. Further, there is no mention in Yang of a reference including device data for direct access to control program in an appliance, obtained from the appliance. Indeed, Yang states that the functions interface accesses the control software for that appliance from the remote control memory, not from the appliance. Further, the interface control signal in Yang, col. 2, lines 27-30, is simply an appliance signal sent to the remote control which the remote control uses to retrieve the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory. The control signal is not a reference that provides direct access to the control program in appliance, as claimed herein. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 9, 22 and 35 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 10, 23 and 36, Yang (col. 5, lines 41-56) does not disclose that *the device information in each device* includes device identification information, as claimed. Yang simply mentions that the interface control signal contains information that uniquely identifies the particular appliance such that the appropriate control software can be retrieved from memory 120 in the remote controller 100 and utilized to configure user interface 140 to control that particular apparatus. However, Yang does not disclose *the device information in each device* includes device identification information, rather the control signal identifies the appliance, which is not based on device information in the appliance. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite specific language in Yang which discloses such limitations. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 10, 23 and 36 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 11, 24 and 37, Yang (col. 4, lines 6-14) does not disclose that the device information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device, as claimed. Indeed, in col. 4, lines 6-14, Yang states: “Functions interface 130, in remote control 100, receives the interface control signal from data interface 110 that is transmitted from appliance 160. Functions interface 130 includes processor 135. Based on the particular interface control signal that is received from the particular apparatus, functions interface 130 will utilize that interface control signal to access the control software from memory 120 in order to configure user interface 140 to control that particular apparatus.” As such, the remote control 100 retrieves the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory 120, and not from the appliance that sent a signal to the remote control 100. The appliances themselves do not include a user control interface description for user interaction with the appliance. Applicant believes that user interface description as claimed is not disclosed by Yang, and even if it is disclosed, the user control interface description for each appliance is in the memory 120 of the remote control 100, not the appliance itself as the Examiner suggests. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite specific language in Yang which discloses such limitations. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 11, 24 and 37 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 12, 25 and 38, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24) does not disclose generating each user interface such that each reference in that user interface is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device, and detecting user selection of a device from one of

said user interfaces, and using a reference in the user interface of the selected device to access the control interface description in the device and then display the control interface description as a control user interface for user command and control of the device, as claimed.

There is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed herein.

By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user an initial user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from

the appliance itself, as claimed herein. Even if based on the Examiner's interpretation (which Applicant traverses), Yang's remote control provides a user with icons representing appliances (col. 8, lines 14-19, relied on by the Examiner), such icons do not form a user interface including reference links that provide direct access to information contained in the appliances, as claimed herein, wherein each reference itself is used to access device information contained in the corresponding appliance.

There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of detecting user selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed.

Not only Yang does not disclose generating a user interface, in Yang there is no step of presenting to a user a user interface with a list of references that provide direct access to control programs contained in the appliances themselves (and there is no need for such a feature in Yang). By contrast, as discussed, in Yang, without user intervention the control programs for appliances are either pre-loaded into the remote control memory, or the remote control automatically downloads an appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite specific language in Yang which discloses such limitations. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 12, 25 and 38 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 13, 26 and 39, Yang (col. 4, lines 6-14; col. 8, lines 14-24 ) does not disclose generating each user interface wherein that user interface further includes device data corresponding to each device based on the information obtained from each device, the device data providing reference to the user control interface description in each device, as claimed.

As discussed in relation to Claim 11, in col. 4, lines 6-14, Yang states that the remote control 100 retrieves the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory 120, and not from the appliance that sent a signal to the remote control 100. The appliances themselves do not include a user control interface description for user interaction with the appliance. Applicant believes that user interface description as claimed is not disclosed by Yang, and even if it is disclosed, the user control interface description for each appliance is in the memory 120 of the remote control 100, not the appliance itself as the Examiner suggests.

In Yang, col. 8, lines 14-24, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed herein.

By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user an initial user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein. Even if based on the Examiner's interpretation (which Applicant traverses), Yang's remote control provides a user with icons representing appliances (col. 8, lines 14-19, relied on by the Examiner), such icons do not form a user interface including references links that provide direct access to information contained in the appliances, as claimed herein, wherein each reference itself is used to access device information contained in the corresponding appliance.

There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of detecting user selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference

in the user interface, as claimed.

Not only Yang does not disclose generating a user interface, in Yang there is no step of presenting to a user a user interface with a list of references that provide direct access to control programs contained in the appliances themselves (and there is no need for such a feature in Yang). By contrast, as discussed, in Yang, without user intervention the control programs for appliances are either pre-loaded into the remote control memory, or the remote control automatically downloads an appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 13, 26 and 39 should be withdrawn.

As per Claims 40, 43 and 44, Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24; col. 6, lines 21-34) does not disclose obtaining the associated information of said device in response to the selection of the reference, generating the control interface including the device data corresponding to said device using the associated information, and displaying the control interface on one or more devices connected to the network capable of displaying a user interface, as claimed. In col. 6, lines 21-34, Yang generally describes a control program, which does not disclose the claimed limitations. Indeed, in col. 4, lines 6-14, Yang states that the remote control 100 retrieves the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory<sup>120</sup>, and not from the appliance that sent a signal to the remote control 100. The appliances themselves do not include a user control interface description for user interaction with the appliance. Applicant believes that user



interface description as claimed is not disclosed by Yang, and even if it is disclosed, the user control interface description for each appliance is in the memory 120 of the remote control 100, not the appliance itself as the Examiner suggests.

In Yang, col. 8, lines 14-24, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance, as claimed herein.

By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user an initial user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference

in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein. Even if based on the Examiner's interpretation (which Applicant traverses), Yang's remote control provides a user with icons representing appliances (col. 8, lines 14-19, relied on by the Examiner), such icons do not form a user interface including reference links that provide direct access to information contained in the appliances, as claimed herein, wherein each reference itself is used to access device information contained in the corresponding appliance.

There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of detecting user selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed.

Not only Yang does not disclose generating a user interface, in Yang there is no step of presenting to a user a user interface with a list of references that provide direct access to control programs contained in the appliances themselves (and there is no need for such a feature in Yang). By contrast, as discussed, in Yang, without user intervention the control programs for appliances are either pre-loaded into the remote control memory, or the remote control automatically downloads an appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claims 40, 43 and 44 should be withdrawn.

As per Claim 42 Yang (col. 8, lines 14-24; col. 6, lines 21-34) does not disclose displaying the control interface of a device by obtaining the associated information of said device in response to the selection of the reference, generating the control interface including the device data corresponding to said device using the associated information, and displaying the control interface, as claimed.

In col. 6, lines 21-34, Yang generally describes a control program, which does not disclose the claimed limitations. Indeed, in col. 4, lines 6-14, Yang states that the remote control 100 retrieves the program code for that appliance from the remote control memory 120, and not from the appliance that sent a signal to the remote control 100. The appliances themselves do not include a user control interface description for user interaction with the appliance. Applicant believes that user interface description as claimed is not disclosed by Yang, and even if it is disclosed, the user control interface description for each appliance is in the memory 120 of the remote control 100, not the appliance itself as the Examiner suggests.

In Yang, col. 8, lines 14-24, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case in which initially information is obtained from the appliances to generate a user interface that includes references for direct access to user interface information in the appliances, such that when a reference in the user interface is user selected, the appliance user interface information in the corresponding appliance is accessed to generate a user interface for user interaction with the selected appliance,

as claimed herein.

By contrast, in Yang, the control programs for appliances are: (1) either pre-loaded into the remote control memory before the user utilizes the remote control to select an appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 19-24), or if the control program of a particular appliance is not preloaded into the remote control memory, then (2) the remote control automatically downloads the appliance control program before the user utilizes the remote control to select the appliance for interaction (col. 8, lines 59-66).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure in Yang of a case where the remote control 100 presents to the user an initial user interface with references for direct access to control programs contained in the appliances 150 themselves, wherein when the user selects an appliance reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 downloads the corresponding control program from the appliance itself, as claimed herein. Even if based on the Examiner's interpretation (which Applicant traverses), Yang's remote control provides a user with icons representing appliances (col. 8, lines 14-19, relied on by the Examiner), such icons do not form a user interface including references links that provide direct access to information contained in the appliances, as claimed herein, wherein each reference itself is used to access device information contained in the corresponding appliance.

There is no case in Yang (col. 8, lines 10-24) which includes the steps of detecting user selection of the reference, using the reference to access the device and display a control interface including device data using associated information of said device corresponding to the reference in the user interface, as claimed. For at least these reasons, rejection of Claim 42 should be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)**

Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 17, 18, 30 and 31 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang is respectfully traversed because no prima facie case of obviousness has been established.

As discussed, Yang does not disclose all of the limitations of base claims from which Claims 4, 5, 17, 18, 30 and 31 depend. However, the Patent Office attempts to modify Yang to reject the claims.

As per Claim 4, 5, as the Examiner also states, Yang does not disclose that the information in each device comprises an HTML page contained in that device. The Examiner relies on Official Notice for the proposition that using hyper-text links and HTML pages as claimed would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner further contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include hyper-text links and HTML pages in Yang to control the appliances remotely from the Internet via HTTP

protocol.

The Official Notice is respectfully traversed. Not only Yang does not disclose such limitations, but the prior art does not disclose such limitations as claimed. Applicant further traverses any conclusion under Official Notice of suggestion or motivation to modify Yang as suggested by the Examiner. If the claims are once again rejected, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide qualifying references under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 that disclose the limitations which the Examiner relied on an Official Notice for, and provide suggestion/motivation for the modification suggested by the Examiner.

It is well settled that in order for a modification or combination of the prior art to be valid, the prior art itself must suggest the modification or combination, "...invention cannot be found obvious unless there was some explicit teaching or suggestion in the art to motivate one of ordinary skill to combine elements so as to create the same invention." *Winner International Royalty Corp. v. Wang*, No. 96-2107, 48 USPQ.2d 1139, 1140 (D.C.D.C. 1998) (emphasis added). "The prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art the motivation to make the proposed molecular modifications needed to arrive at the claimed compound." *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ.2d 1941, 1944 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (emphasis added).

There is no motivation or suggestion in Yang to modify it as the Examiner suggests. Further, as discussed above, Yang does not disclose references (e.g., hyper-text links) for direct

access to control programs in appliances. As such, there is no reason or motivation to include HTML pages in appliances for access (e.g., via hyper-text links). Further, in Yang, there is no mention, motivation or suggestion about Internet or HTTP protocol or HTML pages, or suggestion to utilize such protocols in the remote control 100 or the appliances.

Even if the modification was legally justified, it still would not render Applicants' claimed invention obvious. Yang does not disclose a user interface that includes references to appliances, wherein when the reference for a device is selected by the user, the selected reference is used to access control program information stored in the device to obtain the user interface for the selected device in HTML Page form, for the user to control the device. As discussed, there is no user interface in Yang with references for access to appliances, wherein when the reference is selected by the user, the reference is used to access the appliance and access the user interface (i.e., HTML page) for the appliance. Rather, in Yang, an "interface control signal" is used to access control program of the appliance that is already stored in the remote control memory. As such, the suggested modifications are inapplicable to Yang.

For at least the reasons discussed above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Yang to achieve the solutions provided by the present invention. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find any motivation or suggestion in Yang to modify it as the Examiner suggests. Yang does not obtain appliance control interfaces from the appliances, and need not utilize an HTML control page in each appliance as the control program of each appliance is in

the memory of the remote controller. Even if Yang is modified as the Examiner suggests, the result would be HTML control programs in memory 120 of the remote control 100, rather than HTML page control interface in each device, as claimed. This provides no advantage for the purpose of Yang because of the overhead of HTML pages which requires a browser for viewing in the remote controller 100. The remote controller 100 is dedicated to control the devices, and remote control via the HTTP is neither needed nor possible. Yang is simply not concerned with, nor is appropriate for, the Examiner's proposed modification to allow Yang's appliances to interface the remote control 100 with HTTP protocol or Internet. Indeed, Yang teaches away from the claimed invention since Yang stores the appliance control programs in the memory 120 of the remote control 100, without the need for a HTTP or Internet protocol between the remote control 100 and the appliances.

As per Claim 5, as the Examiner also states, Yang does not disclose displaying the user interface on a browser on a device connected to the network, capable of displaying a user interface, as required by Claim 5. Further, for the reasons above, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Yang, or to modify Yang as suggested by the Examiner to achieve the claimed invention herein. As such, rejection of Claim 5 should be withdrawn.

Claims 17, 30 were rejected for the same reasons as Claim 4, and should therefore be allowed for at least the reasons provided in relation to Claims 4 and 5.



Claims 18, 31 were rejected for the same reasons as Claim 5, and should therefore be allowed for at least the reasons provided in relation to Claims 4 and 5.

The Examiner admits that Yang does not teach all limitations in Claims 4, 5, 17, 18, 30 and 31. Therefore, the Patent Office attempts to modify Yang in order to teach Applicant's claimed invention. However, as discussed, there is no teaching in Yang of the claimed limitations. The effort required to modify Yang as suggested by the Examiner would require a substantial undertaking and numerous elements which would not be obvious. The Examiner is improperly using "hindsight" and the teachings of Applicant's own claimed invention in order to modify Yang to render Applicant's claims obvious. For at least these reasons and the additional reasons provided below, rejection of Claims 4, 5, 17, 18, 30 and 31 should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-1960 for any additional fees for this filing. A duplicate copy of this page is enclosed for that purpose.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn, and the claims be allowed for at least the aforementioned reasons. If it is believed that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, Applicants respectfully request that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the listed telephone number.


**Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: March 23, 2006.

By: Sarah A. Nielsen

Sarah A. Nielsen  
Signature

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth L. Sherman

Reg. No. 33,783

Myers Dawes Andras & Sherman, LLP  
19900 MacArthur Boulevard, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Irvine, CA 92612

Tel: (949) 223-9600

Fax: (949) 223-9610

Customer No.: 23386

3/23/6

(Date)